

LSTA Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Crowne Plaza, Madison, November 11-12, 2008

Tuesday, November 11

Present: Jan Adams, Roxane Bartelt, Terry Dawson, Becki George, Joan Johnson, Deborah Kabler, Bea Lebal, Mildred McDowell, Phyllis Davis, Jeff Gilderson-Duwe, Jim Gingery, Tasha Saecker, Michael Sheehan, and Zora Sampson.

Absent: Jane Pearlmutter (arrived after lunch)

Division Staff: Rick Grobschmidt, Mike Cross, Nancy Anderson, Al Zimmerman, Sally Drew, Bob Bocher, Barb Huntington, Donna Steffan, John DeBacher, David Sleasman, and Terrie Howe.

Also present: Rick Krumwiede, Bruce Smith, and Lisa Strand

Welcome, Opening Remarks, Introductions

Howe welcomed committee members and asked them to introduce themselves.

Public Hearing

Rick Krumwiede, President of the WLA Foundation and Lisa Strand, Executive Director of Wisconsin Library Association (WLA) appeared. Krumwiede said he understood that this is not the meeting where decisions are made for LSTA categories in 2010, but wanted to present a request for funding. He explained the role of the Foundation and the Campaign for Wisconsin Libraries. He referred to his 2007 request for an economic impact study for public libraries. The Foundation took responsibility for promoting the results of that study. He thanked the committee for funding the public library study and asked the committee to consider the economic and community benefits of academic libraries in a future study. WLAF approved the concept of a study. This would be a study developed to determine the benefits to the wider community, and not the benefits to students or faculty. We don't know the value or benefit of academic libraries to businesses or citizens. The proposed study would examine the public perception and would be consistent with the COLAND visioning. The WLA foundation would again take the initiative for disseminating the results. He feels it is consistent with the LSTA long range plan in promoting equitable access and wide range of services, as well as promoting resource sharing and planning for library development. Strand reiterated the issue that people do not understand the benefit or access to materials that they have. In a letter from John R. Politz, he outlined the confusion to chambers, groups, and local residents of academic libraries. Krumwiede added that this might make Wisconsin the first state to study the impact of school, public, and academic libraries. Howe asked if any other state had done such a study. Drew asked whether the study would focus on only four year, public academic libraries. Krumwiede was not sure.

Bruce Smith testified on behalf of the delivery services committee and expressed appreciation for the ongoing support to stabilize the delivery network. The statewide program is set up as a cost-sharing, cost-recovery system, but the extra funding has the benefit of equalizing service to public libraries. Funding has been requested in the state budget, but has not been forthcoming in prior years. A push will be made again this cycle, but the outcome is unclear and there is a 3 billion structural deficit in the budget. The Superintendent has requested half the funding amount in her budget proposal. However,

Smith requested that the LSTA funding be continued in the meantime to preserve the integrity of the existing network, as costs climb and volume increases.

Howe directed the committee to letters that had been distributed or included in the packet. She also directed the committee to comments by Ken Hall on the training/planning category, its current structure and applications to the category.

Sampson asked about Trojanowski's request to combine the non-competitive system categories (technology projects and accessibility). Gingery stated that some of the problem may be that there is not enough money in some of the supplemental categories. He had suggested it go back to being competitive, whereas Trojanowski thought it should be combined into one. Davis stated that, for her system, it would not simplify the process, since she has different staff responsible for the different programs. Sheehan said that for NWLS, it is the case that one person must complete all the grants.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Grobschmidt expressed thanks to the committee and noted that, while the committee is advisory, that its recommendations are considered very significant by the Superintendent. He also noted the challenge of planning for funds that have not yet been granted. He is not sure whether a lame-duck session will make a continuing resolution in Congress, or whether a new Congress will address the funding. Both the Federal and State budgets are uncertain. He thanked Terrie and Division staff for administering the LSTA program.

Review of the Agenda

Howe asked if there were changes to the draft agenda; there were none. There was a motion by Sampson, seconded by Saecker, to approve the agenda as submitted.

Cross noted that we have the room reserved for tomorrow afternoon, but that the committee often does not need it. Lunch will be provided tomorrow regardless.

LSTA Coordinator's Report

Howe reviewed the materials in the packet. Staff will be going over the categories later today and tomorrow morning members can provide input and recommended funding levels.

She asked for corrections of the April minutes.

Page 8, third paragraph, "wondered whether the ... can be part of the collection"

Page 11: Pearlmutter suggested striking her remarks.

Howe noted that Lebal had provided her with a number of typographical corrections.

Pearlmutter moved to approve the minutes as corrected, seconded by Sheehan. The motion carried.

Howe reported that she and Cross would travel to D.C. for training on LSTA programs, which would include a test that must be completed successfully. She said that 42 applications were received this cycle in competitive areas. Members would have the opportunity to comment on them. Some categories had more than sufficient funds; others had insufficient funds.

She directed members to page 15 of the LSTA manual concerning the conflict-of-interest policy and asked if there were questions or concerns. Cross said that members could confer privately with staff if they have questions about a possible contact. Members can indicate when they are abstaining. Lebal

asked about system grants in which her library is participating. Cross said it does not fit the letter of conflict, but that members should act their conscience. If members are uncomfortable making comments or voting, they should use their judgment. Howe added that thirty reviewers were enlisted to review and rank the grants.

Cross directed members to the yellow budget sheet. Zimmerman explained administrative cost limits, salaries and fringes based on contracts, as well as fixed costs assessed by DPI, as well as IT costs. Cross noted that a classification survey on some positions at Reference and Loan Library (RLL) may cause some further adjustments.

Cross directed the committee to the reverse side, listing past, recommended, and requested funding levels. Cross expressed some pessimism on possible LSTA funding levels; hence the conservative projections. McDowell asked whether the committee has a “wish list” in the event there is extra funding. Gilderson-Duwe suggested also making suggestions about a possible funding shortfall, noting that a cut had been made in the funding level for delivery and other projects last year due to a funding cut.

Internal Operations and Statewide Projects

Public Library Development

Cross noted the bright pink packet with DLTCCL state agency projects and reviewed the categories.

Reference and Loan

Drew noted that some staff had been shifted from ILL to Reference for support of the Virtual Reference service. She also noted that some improvements in BadgerLink authentication and federated searching may allow RLL to look at system and locally requested enhancements. Staff has also been shifted to maintain and manage some of the additional databases—(a directory of libraries, the song title index), WI Document Depository, including digital archiving, and there was also a shift in technical staff from WISCAT and Reference & Loan. She was able to manage with the diminished funding resulting last year.

WISCAT

Drew commented on funding levels requested. She noted that CCBC Choices reviews have been added to the database.

Communication and Planning

Grobschmidt reported on the uses in this category, which will not increase from previous levels. Mailing cost reductions for Channel has resulted in some savings.

LSTA Administration

Howe noted that the category had increased between 2007 and 2008 due to higher indirect charges from the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) and partial funding of the LSTA Coordinator position.

Virtual Reference

Drew noted that the amount requested is the amount budgeted in the spring. Staffing at the WILS office may go down and she anticipates the need to take on a greater load at R&LL. Staff will be providing 20 hours of staffing in the upcoming years, a large share of the state required load. She said she has some concern about the viability of the project with the current funding model, since some of the library systems are not taking part and others are not contributing staff. Also, some libraries are using LSTA technology grant funds to pay their portion of the project, meaning more LSTA funds may be supporting the project than in the specific category.

Delivery Projects (SCLS, NWLS)

Drew reported that nothing has changed, that the project is at the amount requested in the spring. The amount was reduced last year because of federal grant levels.

Johnson asked for clarification of the higher total. Drew explained that it coincides with the committee's recommendation for this year. Cross asked what affect state funding would have. She said the committee would need to decide that outcome and noted that this funding is for the public library component only. Davis supplied a piece of information, noting that the half-amount in the proposed state budget, and the LSTA piece would not yield a surplus.

Sampson mentioned the "one system, one library" concept from the COLAND summit, that might result in a single delivery system that would cover the academic costs, as well as the public schools. Drew explained that the issue with schools and other types of libraries was the reliance on the public library system delivery, or arrangements between individual local libraries. She said that WISCAT can be set so that schools can receive delivery at the nearby public library and arrange their own exchange. She noted that the "little red truck" will likely never be able to service individual libraries within the systems. It can at best provide the connection between the systems. At best, coordination can be achieved rather than an increase in stops.

Shared Integrated Library System for Schools

Steffan reported on the proposed shared automation system for schools. She said it is a continuation of the current project that is ongoing this year and has been delayed in its timetable. But it has been running for a few months and there has been a 50% increase in circulation. 50,000 patrons have been entered and she suspects that many are community members, though none of the reports support that assumption. She feels there also has been an increase in the collaboration between libraries using the same vendor for their shared systems. She notes that seven districts have shown an interest in the project, and that three have a high interest and ability to join the project. The project will also include funding for the evaluator who is working on the project now, and who will report at the spring meeting when more data is available.

The committee broke for lunch at 11:50 and resumed at 12:40.

Discussion and Review of 2009 LSTA Applications**External Grant Categories – competitive and noncompetitive***System Technology Projects*

Bocher reviewed typical uses of the grant funds and examples of new applications. He noted some of the restrictions of the Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA), and the BadgerLink program, to avoid duplication. About half of the systems use funding to increase bandwidth (circuit, not Internet access); others enhance the integrated library system; others pay for e-books or other resources not available through the state.

Gilderson-Duwe noted, in comparison to innovative use of technology, that there was some crossover between the System Technology projects category and the Innovative Use of Technology. Bocher replied that there is nothing in the system technology category that implies or requires innovation. Johnson asked about the IFLS training for technology and why it was included here instead of in the library development category. Bocher said that discretion is left to the system. Howe asked Bocher to review what the funds may not be used for. He noted that there are databases requested that are not strong in the BadgerLink project. Johnson asked if the grants are automatically approved since they are not

competitive. Pearlmutter asked whether the Manitowoc-Calumet grant is subject to the filtering requirement. Gilderson-Duwe noted that subsequent language clarifies it.

Merging Shared Automation Systems

Bocher directed members to the purple booklet. He noted that IFLS and Nicolet have submitted grants. He stressed that the staff and committee have encouraged participation in shared integrated library systems (ILS), but that two areas have special considerations that require addressing—the Barron-Rusk County consortium, and the separate system in Brown County, distinct from the Innovative system used by Nicolet/OWLS. Last year the budget constraints pushed part of the IFLS request back to this year. Other funds will help to bring Brown County into the OWLSnet shared system, where they have a cost of over \$400,000.

Wireless Internet Access

Bocher said that \$500 per library was allocated. The total in the category came in at \$10,500, far less than the \$20,000 in the category.

Innovative Use of Technology

Bocher reported that this is the second year we have had a category called “Innovative.” The amount requested was well above the amount budgeted. He noted that the first three grants would fall within the budgeted amounts, and then reviewed some of the grants submitted. Gilderson-Duwe asked whether the IFLS grant overlapped with projects being conducted by Reference & Loan Library (R&LL). Drew said that they had been contacted by IFLS but not enough detail was available at this point to know. Bocher said that it would be no problem to interact with IFLS if their project is funded to see what can be learned or what implication their project has on related state projects. Bocher noted that only one grant is for gaming this year, whereas several were related to gaming in the current year. He noted that the SCLS grant is somewhat different from the current direction of their automated system plans. George noted that Shell Lake’s grant seems similar to the NWLS grant. Davis explained the focus of the Wisconsin Public Library Consortium (WPLC), started with e-Books and now includes all the library systems, the Overdrive project, as well as gadget training in rotating collections.

Library Development Training & Planning

DeBacher summarized the grants submitted and noted some problems not anticipated in the category. He suggested that the last three grants have problems and issues significant enough that they would need to be addressed. No questions or comments.

Digitization

Drew noted that two grants did not apply for the full \$2000 minimum required. Also she noted that the sum of the grants submitted fell below the full grant amount available. One has copyright issues that need to be researched or permissions obtained. She said that none of the materials listed in the grants were inappropriate for the digital collection, but that some needed clarification or restructuring. She noted that more comments have been suggested to lift the restraint on repeat projects. It is harder for the small libraries to carry out the projects and consultation for planning may be needed. LITAC noted that we may not be reaching the scope of libraries to meet the needs for information, expertise and training.

Gilderson-Duwe noted that Drew presented two sides: repeat grants where the training has been done, and assistance for new grantees. Johnson asked why there is a requirement that the data reside on the UW server. What about those having the local resources needed to digitize? Drew said that topic has been discussed, but that the UW system, at least for now, has been the most cost-effective, so that infrastructure would not have to be duplicated locally. She noted that some earlier independent efforts had failed and were not completed. Last year she asked whether a different direction would be

entertained by the committee, which might require a separate category. She said that WiLS had asked about funding for projects through the State Historical Society, but that would require different guidelines and direction.

Davis asked why the current rules about not repeating were adopted—perhaps to train more libraries. Davis is not sure whether the emphasis is to digitize or to train. Drew said that the guidelines had come more from the committee, to spread the opportunity to more libraries and that it may be time to reconsider that direction. Davis suggested that the emphasis be changed to the materials to be digitized, rather than whether the applicant has been previously involved. She is in favor of emphasizing digitization but that the guidelines should be opened up in the future.

Kabler asked whether the UW would accept more than six projects. Drew said that they might consider more than six projects, which is why repeats may be beneficial for the UW staff. UW has a preference for larger projects.

Accessibility

Huntington noted that this category was proposed to see whether there is need or interest on the part of systems to assist their libraries in provide more accessibility to their patrons through projects like wheeled walkers, adaptive workstations or door openers. Sound systems (loop systems), amplifiers, speech-to-text converters were also submitted. Many systems are also doing related training. Lakeshores System is doing a touch-screen application as adaptive technology. She said the system special needs consultants requested more money in this category.

Adams noted that MCFLS had suggested that this category be made competitive rather than non-competitive, since there is not enough money. Gingery noted that Milwaukee Public Library had turned the money down, in large part, since there was so little money available. He felt it was forcing them to come up with a project with possibly not enough funding. Huntington told of a consultant trying to figure out what could be offered to the individual libraries. SWLS will purchase single magnifiers that will be held at the desks. She noted that many smaller libraries still have very basic accessibility needs.

Sensory and Mobility Disabilities

Huntington reviewed the three grants submitted in this category. IFLS will convert the books-by-mail program to focus instead on patrons who have a mobility issue that requires delivery to home. It will allow the large print collection to be developed and offered. For Burlington, four of five reviewers wondered if the funds were displacing local funding for staff. Huntington will need to confirm with Burlington that staffing will need to be clarified. Shell Lake's application requires clarification on the components and relationship of the grant to LSTA purposes. Johnson asked what the Meals on Wheels component was. Huntington said they did not clarify the relationship to LSTA purposes of that project.

Literacy

Huntington stated that she is glad to have a general literacy category that can encompass everything from early learning, through adolescent or even Spanish outreach projects. She outlined some of the weaker grants to show where they had potential but also their deficiencies. She also reviewed some of the benefits that gaming can have for at-risk adolescents in attracting them to the libraries and reading. She noted where some school districts cannot adequately address those needs or obtain the system resources.

Health Information

Howe noted that the total amount requested was very close to the budgeted amount. The grants were generally well prepared and that, while there were some concerns by the reviewers, that none were daunting enough to preclude funding. She noted that the primary focus of funding for two grants was

for library collections; ironic since the focus was supposed to be online resources, collaboration and sharing. The SCLS grant had a large focus on surveying, and that there was a presumed need for the grant.

Johnson asked for process information to clarify what would be done in tomorrow's meeting. Sheehan asked if funding will be decided for each category or for each grant. Howe noted that the committee typically does not recommend partial funding for grants, though Pearlmutter and Cross noted there had been instances in the past of partial funding.

Cross reiterated that that tomorrow they will also consider ideas for categories for 2010. Grobschmidt reviewed the process that takes place in setting the budget, including amendment and subsequent review.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 2:45 p.m.

Wednesday, November 12

Howe convened the committee at 8:40 and explained the process for the day. She asked if there were follow-up questions from Wednesday. Sampson asked where the funds are in the budget to bring in reviewers. Howe explained that reviewers are volunteers and are trained via teleconference and video conference. Sampson recalled that she, as a reviewer, had come to Madison.

Cross explained the formula in the spreadsheet viewed on a screen (Zimmerman was not able to attend the meeting), as well as the process used to discuss and establish funding levels.

Final Recommendations on Applications and Allocation of 2009 Funds

Dawson moved Reference & Loan be funded at \$710,400, seconded by Gilderson-Duwe. There was no discussion. Motion carried.

Adams moved Public Library Development at recommended amount (\$139,300), seconded by Dawson. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

Bartelt moved delivery, seconded by Sampson, at \$90,000. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

Dawson moved Library System Technology projects at \$350,000, seconded by Saecker. (Gilderson-Duwe had withdrawn an earlier motion). There was no discussion, one abstention (Gilderson-Duwe), the motion carried.

Kabler moved to fund WISCAT at the recommended level (\$605,800), seconded by Lebal. There was no discussion, the motion carried, with Davis abstaining.

Gingery questioned the discussion rules on the system block grants for technology, recalling that system directors had participated in discussion previously. Cross clarified the guidelines for establishing categories, when there may have been discussion about the categories, as opposed to the vote for award of grants. Dawson wondered if there is a difference that the category is non-competitive, since there is not an issue of awarding or not awarding specific grants. Davis clarified the wireless category, whether she should avoid voting or making a motion. Cross indicated that she probably should not.

Dawson moved Wireless at \$10,500, with Sheehan seconding. The motion carried with no discussion; Davis abstained.

Adams moved Digitization at \$17,692 seconded by Saecker. There was no discussion. The motion carried with Bartelt abstaining.

Gingery moved to approve the Sensory category at \$37,761. Lebal seconded the motion. Saecker asked whether conditions and clarifications could be established with Burlington, where staffing was unclear. Sampson asked if the funds would become available if they were proposing to fund an existing position. The motion carried after discussion, with Sheehan abstaining.

Adams, seconded by Saecker, moved that the shared systems category be funded at the recommended amount of \$115,000. The motion carried without discussion.

Davis moved to fund the Innovative technology category at \$47,229, seconded by Saecker. There was no discussion. The motion carried with Sheehan abstaining.

Pearlmuter moved to fund the literacy category at \$221,936. Dawson seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion carried with Bartelt, Sheehan, Saecker, and Davis abstaining.

George moved the school shared Integrated Library System (CESA 10) category, seconded by Sheehan, at the amount of \$27,500. Davis asked to clarify the category. The motion carried with Adams abstaining.

Dawson moved Virtual Reference at \$69,300, seconded by Saecker. There was no discussion and the motion carried.

Sampson moved to fund Health Awareness at \$18,727. Johnson seconded. There was no discussion. The motion carried with Davis abstaining.

Johnson moved Accessibility for \$51,100, seconded by George. There was no discussion. The motion carried, with Bartelt, Gilderson-Duwe, Gingery, Sheehan, and Davis abstaining.

Adams moved to fund the Library Development category at \$279,300, seconded by Bartelt. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

Gilderson-Duwe moved to fund the Communications and Planning category at \$25,000. Gingery seconded. There was no discussion and the motion carried.

Gilderson-Duwe moved, seconded by Sheehan, to fund LSTA Administration at \$115,500. There was no discussion and the motion carried.

Johnson moved to fund the Planning & Training category at the requested amount of \$11,912. There was no second.

Saecker moved the Planning and Training category be funded at \$7,486 and was seconded by Bartelt. The motion carried. Johnson was opposed and Sheehan and Davis abstained.

With \$24,293 still on the table, Pearlmuter suggested that it may be prudent to leave some funds available, considering the prospects of the federal and state budget uncertainty. Cross added that we do not know that we will receive the anticipated appropriation amount. Grobschmidt feels there is a probability of a continuing resolution that would result in a reduction because of the formula.

Sampson asked what would happen if more than anticipated funding came in. Howe said that McDowell had asked yesterday whether the committee would have input. Cross stated that the committee is

welcome to make “what if” motions. In the past, additional and unallocated funds have been rolled into subsequent budgets. Cross added the uncertainty of the state budget, with an anticipated \$5 billion deficit, they certainly might be needed.

Gingery noted that in the early learning and literacy category and wondered if the last three grants might be worthy of funding. He moved to fund at \$229,136, in order to fund one additional grant. Dawson seconded the motion. McDowell stated that her preference would be to fund any and all applications, if possible, if funds should be available. Sampson asked what would happen with fewer funds. Cross stated that the Superintendent would have to consider reduced awards. Sampson mentioned what had happened this year, where delivery and shared integrated systems had been reduced. Pearlmutter asked when it would be known whether the funds would be allocated. She added that it would be better to inform those institutions where grants are funded and inform others later, when the funds are on hand. Kabler stated an alternative point of view, where directors might seek other funds when grants may be coming. Davis said it depends on the grant, the libraries, and partners, to determine whether a project is started or whether it is put aside until the grant is absolutely known. Gingery said he agrees with McDowell, that it is the committee’s mission to get as close to the amount requested as possible.

Davis stated that she thinks it is the committee’s job to allocate what is set aside, but also that literacy and technology are worthy categories and it would be good to fund another grant when possible. Gilderson-Duwe called the question (to fund one more literacy grant). The motion carried, with Bartelt, Davis, Sheehan and Saecker abstaining.

The motion left \$17,083 unassigned. Johnson asked whether, if additional amounts are added to a category, if the next ranked grant must be funded, or if a project could be taken out of order. Cross said that it has been practice to fund grants in the ranked order.

Sampson moved, seconded by Johnson, to recommend funding an additional project in the Innovative Technology category, bringing the total to \$62,829. After discussion, the motion was amended to make the grant contingent upon available funds. The motion carried with Pearlmutter, Kabler, Lebal, and Dawson voting against the motion.

Consideration of Preliminary Categories for 2010

Davis wondered if the committee should consider the problem of availability of funds. If available, she is intrigued by the idea of doing the study of the value of academic libraries if funds are available. She does not see funds becoming available to do that. Johnson said it may be possible if other categories are closed out. Howe stated that Wireless and Merging Shared ILS systems will sunset.

However, Pearlmutter wondered if there is a very mixed message since there was indication that marketing might be more effective since the requestors said that there is a problem of awareness of the library, and that the study may not yield a positive outcome. She also thought it may be more effective to include and measure the two year campuses and technical colleges, and that did not seem to be included. Davis felt that the public library impact study has provided good talking points and the academic library study could take it further.

Cross circulated a copy of the Indiana study that had included the academic libraries. DeBacher noted that the study is linked on the Division site. Sampson wondered if it may also be more effective to include the technical colleges or to primarily focus on them. Drew noted that there is considerable variance in how much the campus libraries are available to the communities, so that the study should perhaps focus on those that are.

Dawson said that the idea is a sound one but wonders if it is developed yet, and whether it should be further developed. Drew wondered about doing it with a sample. George brought up the COLAND report and the need of collaboration and wondered if an innovative collaboration project might be useful or helpful. Perhaps focused on skills for 21st century learning or related. It might focus or offer marketing, public relations, but falling back to cooperation and collaboration. Howe noted, however, that the LSTA purposes may preclude marketing and public relations.

Drew noted that information literacy could be included and funded. Steffan referred to the LITAC paper on information literacy and that a category might model information literacy if different types of libraries are brought together.

Davis asked under what purpose or category the public library impact study was conducted. Howe said it had been under library development. Gilderson-Duwe said that the study would establish what we know, and the Foundation would promote it. Drew discussed the statewide library card, what it would mean, and noted that, at this stage, it is unknown whether costs would be associated with establishing a card. Sampson asked if Drew is suggesting that a model or pilot be conducted in an area of the state. Drew said that would be a possibility.

Howe noted that other suggestions had been made, including combining sensory with accessibility and making a single system block grant application, which would not work. Gingery reminded the committee of the discussion of the digitization category and suggested that repeat and extension grants should be considered. Lebal suggested giving extra points or consideration for new projects. She added that it is an area that might take longer for small libraries to get involved, whereas larger libraries may be better equipped. Howe expressed concern, supported by Drew, whether the UW could manage a large number of new, smaller grants. Dawson wondered if the requirement that projects be done only through the UW system be reconsidered. DeBacher reminded the committee of past discussions, that the UW-project was done to serve as a demonstration and training and that libraries could continue with local resources. He noted that past LSTA committee minutes are available online. Drew said that if libraries are concerned about "branding," that the libraries use the high-resolution copy of the digitized material provided by the UWDC and do with it as they please.

Davis expressed concern that the WHO project may not have stability and that the current method has viability and the committee must carefully consider the direction for digitization. Kabler noted that some are using system technology funds to conduct local or regional projects. Gilderson-Duwe noted that Oshkosh did start with a UW project now has their own scanner and is doing projects using their own resources, having started and building their expertise through an initial grant. Perhaps more digitization should be encouraged through innovative technology. Pearlmuter stated that standards and ability to search can be an issue where having adopted standards can really help. Lebal noted that her library had also done a UW project initially and subsequently did a project through WiLS/Wisconsin Heritage Online (WHO).

Gilderson-Duwe wondered if it is legitimate to give a small library extra points or consideration to participate in grant submission. Howe thought that could be problematic. Grobschmidt suggested having a category available only to small libraries as a way to address that. Kabler suggested small libraries grouping together. Grobschmidt noted that some other grant programs he is familiar with, like a larger school district putting together a project but are required to collaborate or partner with smaller entities. Davis agreed that emphasis to new or group applicants might be attractive, but that she has seen instances where the goal is not well served.

Grobschmidt commented on George's reference to the visioning summit, and noted that COLAND had discussed the use of LSTA funding to initiate some of the outcomes. He noted that some other states have used LSTA to fund very large projects. He mentioned the bandwidth issue and universal information literacy, the "anchor store" concept and also the "embedded librarian," that might also

serve as a category for consideration. He referred to a regional economic development project, G7 in the Milwaukee area, or the New North projects, which might benefit by a librarian. Davis and Gilderson-Duwe both reported that such a concept is difficult when libraries are forced to make personnel cuts to meet budget constraints.

Davis reminded also that the LSTA money has been constrained for so many years since a large share of available funds are used for WISCAT, which constrains any large-scale new projects. Pearlmutter said that the shared and merged ILS categories have been a priority that came out of LSTA. She said that other new money will not be feasible in the current climate so it may require closing out some categories in order to sponsor some new ideas. Cross gave credit to the literacy categories that build collaboration into its requirements and helps build associations between the library and other organizations. Huntington credited Frances De Usabel who years ago had incorporated that strategy.

Huntington commented also on the training sessions that are offered for each category, that stress what the reviewers are going to utilize, and suggested that some of the applicants do not take advantage of these sessions.

George said she is suggesting a category for collaborative partnerships. Perhaps, in light of the COLAND recommendations, LSTA should emphasize those partnerships among multiple types of libraries, business groups and non-profit organizations that would emphasize and support the value of public libraries. Johnson supported the notion of necessary collaboration. Davis suggested that collaboration is already part of the library mission and, while it is a great idea to promote it, it is already something we have built into our mission. She wondered if it would require a new category. Howe and Pearlmutter confirmed that was the direction of discussion. George stated that the sky is the limit and that demonstrating the value of libraries is important in this climate. Gilderson-Duwe thinks that the collaboration should be narrowed and related to specific purposes. Steffan wondered if something like "Innovative Collaboration Projects" might be useful. Gilderson-Duwe said he hoped the word "Innovation" could be avoided. DeBacher mentioned the difficulty that libraries will face, competing with other social service and health agencies, which may give another meaning to "embedded librarian" in regard to outreach and distribution of information to and from other agencies.

Davis mentioned joint or collaboration electronic resource or joint collection development and wondered if that might serve as a new project.

Cross reminded the committee about the suggestion to combine the accessibility and special needs sensory categories. Johnson supported that notion. Gingery said his comment was to increase funding but to make the category competitive, not more money as non-competitive. Johnson wondered if there would be problems combining the categories. Gilderson-Duwe noted the Burlington project seemed worthy and unique to him and that it might not have been able to be submitted if it were non-competitive. Bartelt added that she thought we should not close the door on small libraries and wondered if something could be added or considered as adult literacy. Huntington said it would have to be expanded to include mental and sensory disabilities.

DeBacher feels there is a problem that small and medium-sized libraries are reluctant to apply for LSTA grants. This may be the case either because they cannot apply or they are not aware of the possibility or feasibility of getting funded. He feels that the Division may need to improve promotion of new categories, encourage new applicants, or simplify the application forms.

Howe asked for input on the forms and application process.

Johnson asked again about the training grants and wondered about other input submitted. Davis said she finds herself on both sides, and that training can be library development. She said her system had

done some of that training with CE funds, but that it was attractive and helpful to partner with other systems to get a “big speaker.” She wonders if the planning could continue to be included.

DeBacher said his preference would be to limit the category to planning only and limit it to individual libraries. Dawson said he could see promise in that because it is more difficult for libraries to develop and complete competitive grants, and also that planning has become more difficult too. He feels there could be a lot of interest.

Pearlmutter said that the system coordinators for continuing education discussed at its annual meeting whether a director technology course could be developed and required for certification. She said that it had been tried in the past, but that interest had not been sufficient to maintain it. She felt that certification could be reconsidered and perhaps a requirement for technology could be included. She felt, too, that the boot camp might be a good pilot. Howe mentioned a recent WLA program where there was considerable agreement on the need for more discussion and training on library leadership. Pearlmutter concurred.

Steffan said that the planning project might be a summit, bringing in a speaker to conduct a large training, followed by local systems and library training. Steffan discussed the adolescent literacy summit that kicked off a project that was then to continue at the libraries. She mentioned that her team now does two-day workshops on the technology plans required by school districts. Davis said that is why the systems had gone in together to bring in the national speaker. Gilderson-Duwe followed up on Davis’s comment on the requirement for a local component, that he had experienced state consultants requiring plans, but there was no local support or follow-up.

Howe asked again whether there were any changes needed in the LSTA forms and application process. DeBacher reminded the committee that there had been issues about incompatible browsers, versions, and inflexibility of the forms.

Gingery mentioned that he had changed his mind about the accessibility category. He felt that there should be a system-wide non-competitive category for accessibility.

Grobschmidt thanked the five (Pearlmutter, Davis, Sampson, Gingery, Dawson) whose terms ended in December and requested suggestions for future members to be appointed. He also congratulated Saecker on her library, Menasha, being selected WLA Library of the Year.

Dawson suggested changing or adjusting the conflict of interest statement in the *LSTA Information and Guidelines*, to narrow the comment restrictions of committee members to the competitive categories. Cross thought that this change sounded reasonable.

Howe asked about possible dates in April and for the next meeting. Dates will be announced later.

Howe adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.